

CEM AND MI JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE: OVERVIEW OF FEEDBACK AND UPDATES TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

Comments provided by members	Proposed changes	Notes
<p>Please confirm the ToR, 3 Composition; as we have one chair with the MISC governance, the wording should be modified from "one of the MI SC's chairs or Vice Chairs" to "the MI SC's chair or one of the Vice Chairs" or "one of the MISC's chair or Vice Chairs" as appropriate.</p>	<p>Updated to: '...and the MI SC's Chair or one of the Vice Chairs...'</p>	
<p>Add an explanation of the role and composition of the SLT (we think it stands for senior leadership team and was referenced repeatedly in the BA documents)</p>	<p>Suggest that we avoid creating this as a formal sub-group in the JSC ToR as to date it has been used as an ad hoc consultation mechanism used by the BA team.</p>	
<p>Add a clause about how often the joint steering committee will review its terms of reference and its performance/operations</p>	<p>Added a new paragraph on this:</p> <p>9. Duration, Modifications and Termination: The Terms of Reference for the JSC will enter into effect on 17 May 2023, subject to no objections being received from CEM or MI members.</p> <p>JSC members will be invited to reflect on the operations and performance of the JSC every three years to ensure that it is fit for purpose. Any JSC member may request a modification, revision, or termination of the JSC's Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Any such requests will be considered by all JSC members in the first instance and then shared with all CEM and MI members for approval on a no-objection basis.</p>	<p>Annual review quite heavy if JSC is only meeting twice a year – would essentially mean discussing this every other meeting so suggest a three-year review cycle.</p>
<p>Add an explanation about how frequently and through what means the JSC will communicate out to all members on its discussions, decisions, next steps, etc. Our suggestion would be after each meeting and there are several examples of means through which discussions/decisions</p>	<p>Partially covered under paragraph 4 which could be updated with additional detail (highlighted) as follows:</p> <p>'The MI and CEM Secretariats will work together to develop the agenda for the meeting, oversee the logistics of the meeting and to summarise key elements of the discussions and follow up actions after each meeting</p>	

CEM AND MI JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE: OVERVIEW OF FEEDBACK AND UPDATES TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

<p>could be communicated e.g. could be separate to CEM members and MI members, could be joint; could be responsibility of secretariats, could be responsibility of the chairs; could be at regularly scheduled meetings, could be ad-hoc.</p>	<p>which will be shared with JSC members and then all CEM and MI members by the respective Secretariats in a timely manner.'</p>	
<p>Clarify that JSC resource oversight (paragraph #7) is strategic in nature. Add that funds received from philanthropies/contributors would be received by a Trustee to support joint activities consistent with the allocations made by the approval of JSC. The Trustee would also need to provide regular reports on financial status to JSC.</p>	<p>Updated to read, '...JSC may provide strategic guidance regarding the use of any shared resources' and, 'If and when shared financial resources are involved, an appropriate mechanism will need to be agreed with the JSC for the receipt and disbursement of funds, with regular updates made to the JSC.'</p>	
<p>Concerning the time limit under „Determinations“ we received the suggestion to potentially prolong it to 3 weeks. However this is no red line for us.</p>	<p>Updated to, 'three weeks' notice'</p>	
<p>Confirm our non-objection to the text as circulated. In case a new version is being considered, we would propose some minor changes for your consideration with the intention to add clarity: In section 5, which refers to decision making, perhaps the title could be explicit. Also a difference between decisions and recommendations may be valuable, perhaps by adding reference to the extent these would be binding.</p>	<p>Have updated section 5 so that deal with recommendations first and then decision-making role for joint projects.</p> <p>“JSC members may be invited to provide feedback and recommendations on areas of mutual interest and strategic importance for both CEM and MI. Recommendations made by the JSC are intended to help guide the work of CEM and MI and do not create any legally binding obligations between or among CEM and MI members.</p> <p>In addition, the JSC may steward joint projects, which may include a decision-making role for JSC members. Where decisions are required, JSC members will be provided with three weeks' notice so that they can consider and confirm their position, unless the JSC decides on a no-objection basis to waive this requirement.</p>	

CEM AND MI JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE: OVERVIEW OF FEEDBACK AND UPDATES TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

	<p>All recommendations and decisions of the JSC are intended to be made in a transparent manner and on a no-objection basis. All decisions regarding the individual governance of CEM and MI are reserved for their respective SCs and/or the broader membership, as appropriate.”</p>	
<p>In section 8 we would propose to strengthen the language: “The JSC will help set the strategic direction for any joint communication efforts”.</p>	<p>We would suggest revisiting this role of the JSC once we have some examples of how this works in practice.</p>	
<p>Point 7 of TOR: the phrase "Breakthrough Agenda" should be deleted from the point. It may be written as ".....such as on the areas of mutual interest or strategic importance, or other shared projects".</p>	<p>Updated to: ‘...for joint or shared projects that have been agreed by the JSC.’</p>	<p>Have avoided reference to areas of mutual interest and shared importance to avoid any ambiguity. JSC should give their explicit agreement for any resourcing oversight.</p>
<p>The following statement shall be included in the TOR document: “JSC is a forum for voluntary collaboration between the individual CEM and MI Steering Committee (SC), not a governing body for them. JSC will only work on areas of mutual interest or strategic importance. It will not make any decisions on any independent CEM or MI business/ projects.”</p>	<p>Partially covered these principles in the ToR but have added the suggested wording to the introduction for additional context:</p> <p>‘The JSC is intended to serve as a mechanism for voluntary collaboration between the individual CEM and MI SCs, not a governing body for them. The JSC will only work on areas of mutual interest or strategic importance. It will not make any decisions on any independent CEM or MI business or projects.’</p> <p>To note, decision making aspect also reinforced under paragraph 5.</p>	